



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/559,669	12/06/2005	Takao Horiuchi	2005-1423A	7214
513 7590 02/13/2008 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021				
EXAMINER ZERVIGON, RUDY				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1792				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/13/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/559,669

Applicant(s)

HORIUCHI ET AL.

Examiner

Rudy Zervigon

Art Unit

1792

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 December 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/6/2005
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a,e) as being anticipated by Patel; Satyadev R. et al. (US 6942811 B2). Patel teaches a substrate (14; Figure 2; column 4; line 37) processing system (Figure 2; column 4; lines 21-66) comprising: a gas supply source (19 or 20; Figure 2; column 3; lines 15-25) for supplying a process gas containing a reactive substance; a reservoir tank (12; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25) connected to said gas supply source (19 or 20; Figure 2; column 3; lines 15-25) for reserving said process gas; a reactor (15; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25) for exposing a substrate (14; Figure 2; column 4; line 37) placed therein to said process gas; a first circulation pipe (36; Figure 2; column 5; line 2) for introducing the process gas inside said reactor (15; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25) into said reservoir tank (12; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25); a second circulation pipe (return at 85; Figure 2; column 5; line 2) for introducing at least part of the process gas in said reservoir tank (12; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25) into said reactor (15; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25); and a flow regulating valve (85; Figure 2; column 3; line 20) disposed in said second circulation pipe (return at 85; Figure 2; column 5; line 2) for regulating the amount of process gas to be introduced into said reactor (15;

Art Unit: 1792

Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25), as claimed by claim 1. Applicant's claim requirement of "a process gas containing a reactive substance" is a claim requirement of intended use in the pending apparatus claims. Further, it has been held that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter , 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto , 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP2111.02).

Patel further teaches:

- i. The substrate (14; Figure 2; column 4; line 37) processing system (Figure 2; column 4; lines 21-66) of claim 1, further comprising a pump (23; Figure 2; column 3; line 25) for drawing said process gas from said reactor (15; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25) and introducing it into said reservoir tank (12; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25) through said first circulation pipe (36; Figure 2; column 5; line 2), as claimed by claim 2
- ii. The substrate (14; Figure 2; column 4; line 37) processing system (Figure 2; column 4; lines 21-66) of claim 1, further comprising a second gas supply source (29; Figure 2) for supplying a second process gas to said reactor (15; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25) such that the second process gas bypasses said reservoir tank (12; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25), said second process gas containing a reactive substance different from that contained in said first process gas, as claimed by claim 3. Applicant's claim requirement of "said second process gas containing a reactive substance different from that contained

in said first process gas” is a claim requirement of intended use in the pending apparatus claims. Further, it has been held that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter , 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto , 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP2111.02).

- iii. The substrate (14; Figure 2; column 4; line 37) processing system (Figure 2; column 4; lines 21-66) of claim 2, further comprising a second gas supply source (29; Figure 2) for supplying a second process gas to said reactor (15; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25) such that the second process gas bypasses said reservoir tank (12; Figure 2; column 3; lines 10-25), said second process gas containing a reactive substance different from that contained in said first process gas, as claimed by claim 4. Applicant’s claim requirement of “said second process gas containing a reactive substance different from that contained in said first process gas” is a claim requirement of intended use in the pending apparatus claims. Further, it has been held that claim language that simply specifies an intended use or field of use for the invention generally will not limit the scope of a claim (Walter , 618 F.2d at 769, 205 USPQ at 409; MPEP 2106). Additionally, in apparatus claims, intended use must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art

structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim (In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963); MPEP 2111.02).

Conclusion

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Rudy Zervigon whose telephone number is (571) 272-1442. The examiner can normally be reached on a Monday through Thursday schedule from 8am through 7pm. The official fax phone number for the 1792 art unit is (571) 273-8300. Any Inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Chemical and Materials Engineering art unit receptionist at (571) 272-1700. If the examiner can not be reached please contact the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh, at (571) 272-1435.

/Rudy Zervigon/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1792